chair John Chiang member Judy Chu, Ph.D. member Michael C. Genest

State of California Franchise Tax Board

#### June 2008 Franchise Tax Board Public Litigation Roster

All currently active cases and those recently closed are listed on the roster. Activity or changes with respect to a case appear in bold-face type. Any new cases will appear in bold-face type.

A list of new cases that have been added to the roster for the month is also provided, as well as a list of cases that have been closed and will be dropped from the next report.

The Franchise Tax Board posts the Litigation Roster on its Internet site. The Litigation Roster can be found at: http://www.ftb.ca.gov/law/litrstr/index.html.

The Litigation Rosters for the last four years may be found on the Internet site.

## FRANCHISE AND INCOME TAX Closed Cases – June 2008

# <u>Case Name</u> <u>Court Number</u>

Deluxe Corporation San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07462305

## FRANCHISE AND INCOME TAX New Cases – June 2008

<u>Case Name</u> <u>Court Number</u>

Du, Benjamin R. & Carmela Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC391413

Gribble, Stanley W. &

SWG Management Company Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC393360

# FRANCHISE AND INCOME TAX MONTHLY REFUND LITIGATION ROSTER

#### **June 2008**

ABBOTT LABORATORIES & Affiliates v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC369808 Filed – 04/20/07

Court of Appeal, 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellate Dist. No. B204210

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
J. Pat Powers

ETB's Counsel
Brian Wesley

Baker & McKenzie, LLP

Scott L Brandman (NY) Baker & McKenzie, LLP

Issue: Whether Plaintiffs were entitled to a deduction under section 24402 after the statute was found to be

unconstitutional.

<u>Years</u>: 1999-2000 <u>Amount</u> \$2,340,093.00

**Status: Defendant/Respondent's Brief filed on June 24, 2008.** 

APPLE, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC08471129 Filed – 01/16/08

\*Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

Jeffrey M. Vesely Kristian Whitten

Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw, Pittman, LLP

Issues: 1. Whether the Franchise Tax Board properly determined the order in which dividends are paid from

earnings and profits.

2. Whether the Franchise Tax Board improperly allocated and disallowed interest.

Year: 09/30/89 Amount \$231,038.00

**Status:** Mandatory Settlement Conference rescheduled to January 9, 2009. Trial rescheduled to

January 26, 2009. Case Management Conference taken off calendar on June 30, 2008.

BAKERSFIELD MALL, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. No. CGC07462728 Filed – 04/25/07

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District No. A119709

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin

Marguerite Stricklin

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether the LLC fee imposed on an LLC doing business entirely within California by Rev. Tax. Code §17942 is unconstitutional under the due process, equal protection and commerce clauses of

the U.S. Constitution.

2. Whether Rev. Tax. Code §17942 violates Article XIII, section 26 of the California Constitution.

3. Whether Rev. Tax. Code §17942 constitutes an invalid exercise of the states police power and is void.

<u>Years</u>: 2000 through 2004 <u>Amount</u> \$56,537.00

Status: Trial continued to July 24, 2008.

#### BANISTER, JOSEPH R. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court No. 06CS00930 (Petition Writ of Mandate)

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS04091 (Claim for Refund)

Taxpayer's Counsel

Joseph R. Banister (Pro Per)

Filed – 07/10/06

Transferred – 09/14/07

FTB's Counsel

Amy Winn

Issues: 1. Whether plaintiff has a California filing obligation.

2. Whether penalties were properly assessed against plaintiff.

<u>Year</u>: 2002 <u>Amount</u> \$895.00 Tax

\$537.50 Penalty

Status: Docket No. 07AS04091:

Trial Setting Conference held on June 16, 2008. Settlement Conference scheduled for August 14, 2008. Trial scheduled for September 16, 2008.

#### **BAYER CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board**

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS03350 Filed – 07/23/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Eric J. Coffill, Carley A. Roberts

Morrison & Foerster, LLP

Steven J. Green

<u>Issue</u>: Whether the value of Plaintiff's inventory was properly calculated for each of the years for purposes of

determining its cost of goods sold.

<u>Years</u>: 1993-1994 <u>Amount</u> \$2,481,551.00

Status: Discovery proceeding.

# BRAR, KALDEEP S. & IMELDA A. & PROFESSIONAL RESOURCE ENTERPRISES, INC. v.

**Franchise Tax Board** 

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC365233 Filed – 01/24/07

Court of Appeal, 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellate District No. B207757

Taxpayer's Counsel

Robert F Klueger, Esq.

FTB's Counsel

Mark P. Richelson

Boldra, Klueger & Stein, LLP

<u>Issue</u>: 1. Whether FTB properly determined the Los Angeles Revitalization Zone credit carryovers to which

Plaintiffs were entitled.

<u>Year</u>: 1999 <u>Amount</u> \$335,885.53

Status: Plaintiffs' Notice of Appeal filed on May 13, 2008.

BRATTON, KERRY M. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07461671 Filed - 03/23/07<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Thomas F. Carlucci Filed - 03/23/07Amy J. Winn

Foley & Lardner, LLP

Issue: Whether the penalty for the promotion of an abusive tax shelter provided for in section 19177 was

properly assessed to Plaintiff.

<u>Year</u>: 2003 <u>Amount</u> \$3,996,235.94 Penalty

Status: Case Management Conference scheduled for June 25, 2008, taken off calendar on June 3, 2008.

CITY NATIONAL CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC334772 Filed – 06/10/05

Court of Appeal, 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellate District No. B189240

California Supreme Court No. S150563

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Kenneth R. Chiate, Mary S. Thomas

<u>FTB's Counsel</u>
Donald R. Currier

Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart, Oliver & Hedges, LLP

Sherrill Johnson

Offices of the General Counsel

City National Bank

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiff improperly engaged in tax shelter transaction involving Regulated Investment Trusts (REITs) and Regulated Investment Companies (RICs) during the subject years.

2. Whether certain subsidiaries were exempt from California taxation as IRC 501(c)(15) entities.

3. Whether Plaintiff has satisfied the requirement of exhausting all administrative remedies in order to

maintain a lawsuit.

Years: 1999 through 2003 Amount \$84,676,129.00

Status: Case Management Conference continued to August 8, 2008.

#### CITY NATIONAL CORPORATION & Subs. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 06AS02275

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u> Kenneth R. Chiate

Remedi R. Chiac

Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart Oliver & Hedges, LLP

Filed – 06/06/06 <u>FTB's Counsel</u> Molly K. Mosley

Sherrill Johnson

Offices of the General Counsel

City National Bank

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Plaintiffs improperly engaged in tax shelter transaction involving Real Estate Investment Trusts

(REITs).

<u>Year</u>: 2004 <u>Amount</u> \$23,900,000.00

Status: Defendant's Notice of Entry of Order to Stay Action Pending Certain Developments in Related Los

Angeles Action filed on April 3, 2008.

#### DELUCCHI, MARIO & KATHLEEN, et al. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 06AS02661 Filed – 06/22/06

Court of Appeal, 3<sup>rd</sup> Appellate District No. C056503

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselHarry Gordon Oliver IIGeorge Spanos

Attorney at Law

Issues: 1. Whether Plaintiffs properly computed income on an installment sale.

- 2. Whether Plaintiffs may be deemed to have elected out of the installment method.
- 3. Whether Plaintiffs' gain on the sale of a stock qualified for exemption as Small Business Stock in 1995.

Year: 1995 Amount \$954,800.00

Status: Defendant/Respondent's Brief filed on June 10, 2008.

#### DICON FIBEROPTICS, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC367885 Filed – 03/13/07

Court of Appeal, 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellate District No. B202997

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselThomas R. Freeman, Paul S. Chan,Mark Richelson

Bird, Marella, Boxer, Wolpert,

Nessim, Drooks & Lincenberg, P.C.

Marty Dakessian

Mardiros, Hagop, Dakessian

Issue: Whether Franchise Tax Board properly denied EZ Credits claimed by Plaintiff.

<u>Year</u>: Ending 03/31/07 <u>Amount</u> \$1,104,992.00

Status: Plaintiff/Appellant's Reply Brief filed on June 4, 2008. Application of Deluxe Corporation for

Leave to File Amicus Curiae Brief, and Request for Judicial Notice, filed on June 17, 2008.

DU, BENJAMIN R. AND CARMELA v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC391413

Taxpayer's Counsel

Charles P. Rettig, Steven Toscher

Sharyn M. Fisk & Michael R. Stein

Hochman, Salkin, Rettig, Toscher & Perez, P.C.

**Issue:** Whether plaintiffs are entitled to interest suspension under Revenue and Taxation Code section

19116.

Year: 1999 Amount \$288,938.00 Interest

**Status: Plaintiffs'Summons and Complaint served on June 4, 2008.** 

#### DUFFIELD, DAVID A. & CHERYL D. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07459331

Taxpayer's Counsel

Jeffrey M. Vesely

Kerne H. O. Matsubara, Annie H. Huang

Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw, Pittman, LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiffs exchange of PeopleSoft Stock for the stock of Nevada Pacific Development Corporation qualified as a tax-free exchange pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code section

- 2. Whether Plaintiffs were subject to the penalty imposed by section 19777.5.
- 3. Whether the penalty imposed by section 19777.5 meets Due Process requirements.
- 4. Whether Plaintiffs were entitled to an abatement of interest pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code section 19104.

<u>Year</u>: 1994 <u>Amount</u> \$7,152,029.00 Tax

\$4,006,669.25 Penalty

Status: Hearing on Order to Show Cause scheduled for June 10, 2008, taken off calendar.

#### ELS EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS0307

Taxpayer's Counsel

Robert R. Rubin

McDonough, Holland & Allen, PC

Filed – 07/05/07 FTB's Counsel

Filed - 05/23/08

FTB's Counsel

Filed - 01/05/07

FTB's Counsel

David Lew

Donald R. Currier

Robert Asperger

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Plaintiff was entitled for California purposes, to elect out of treatment provided by

section 338(h)(10) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Year: 08/28/97 Amount \$630,615.97

**Status: Trial Setting Conference continued to September 15, 2008.** 

FREIDBERG, EDWARD AND TRACI REYNOLDS v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS02358 Filed - 02/02/07  $\underline{Taxpayer's\ Counsel}$  Edward Freidberg, Suzanne M. Alves Amy Winn Freidberg & Parker Larry Keethe

Issue: Whether Franchise Tax Board was required to credit the amount of a non-final judgment to satisfy

Plaintiffs' self-assessed taxes for years subsequent to those involved in the judgment.

<u>Years</u>: 2003 and 2004 <u>Amount</u> \$9,326.32 Penalty

**Status:** Tentative Statement of Decision in favor of Plaintiff filed on June 3, 2008.

#### GARCIA, W. ROCKE AND GLENDA L. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC06456659 Filed - 10/02/06<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

William J. McLean Fried - 10/02/06Kristian Whitten

A Professional Law Corporation

<u>Issue</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiffs timely acquired replacement real property in compliance with the Internal Revenue Code section 1033.

- 2. Whether a decision by the State Board of Equalization precludes the assessment of penalties pursuant to section 19777.5.
- 3. Whether the penalty assessed by Section 19777.5 satisfies due process requirements.

<u>Year</u>: 1992 <u>Amount</u> \$357,009.00 Tax

\$259,056.00 Penalty

Status: Order Granting Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorneys' Fees filed on June 27, 2008.

GENERAL MILLS, INC. & SUBSIDIARIES v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC05439929 Filed – 03/29/05

Court of Appeal, 1<sup>st</sup> Appellate Dist. No. A120492

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselThomas H. SteeleJoyce Hee

Andres Vallejo, Jeffrey S. Terraciano

Morrison & Foerster LLP

Paul H. Frankel

Morrison & Foerster LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether the Plaintiffs' payroll factor was properly computed by excluding foreign employee stock options.

- 2. Whether the Plaintiffs' sales factor was properly calculated by excluding receipts from commodities transactions and short-term financial instruments.
- 3. Whether federal RAR adjustments were properly taken into account.

<u>Years</u>: 1992 through 1997 <u>Amount</u> \$3,950,026.00

Status: Stipulation of Extensions of Time for Filing Respondent's Brief and Appellant's Reply Brief filed on

May 5, 2008.

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION, et al. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC269404 Filed - 03/06/02

Court of Appeal, 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellate District No. B165665

California Supreme Court No. S127086

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselCharles R. AjalatStephen LewLaw Office of Ajalat, Polley & AyoobDonald Currier

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether gross receipts from the disposition of marketable securities were properly excluded from the sales factor.

- 2. Whether interest income was properly characterized as business income.
- 3. Whether dividends received with respect to stock representing less than a 50% voting interest were properly classified as business income.
- 4. Whether the limitation on deductions prescribed by sections 24402 and 24410 resulted in unconstitutional discriminatory taxation.
- 5. Whether various receipts from intangible assets were properly excluded from the sales factor.
- 6. Whether research tax credits were properly limited to the entity incurring the expense.
- 7. Whether a deduction was properly denied with respect to foreign country taxes withheld on dividends.
- 8. Whether the taxpayer is entitled to an increased deduction with respect to depreciation on assets held by foreign country subsidiaries.
- 9. Whether the taxes determined to be owing by the Franchise Tax Board were properly computed and assessed.

Years: 1986 through 1988 Amount \$10,692,755.00

<u>Status</u>: Discovery Proceeding. Final Status Conference scheduled for September 29, 2008. Trial scheduled for October 1, 2008.

GOLDEN WEST HEALTH PLAN, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC353849 Filed – 06/15/06

Court of Appeal, 2<sup>nd</sup> Appellate Court Dist. No. B205246

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselAlan R. MalerMarla Markman

Greenberg Traurig, LLP

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Plaintiff made a valid S Corporation election for California purposes.

<u>Years</u>: 04/01/03 through 06/01/03 Amount \$669,045.00

Status: Plaintiff/Appellant's Stipulation of Extension of Time to file Opening Brief to August 14, 2008,

filed on June 17, 2008.

#### GONZALES, THOMAS J. II v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC06454297 Filed - 07/18/06 <u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Martin A. Schainbaum, Esq. Filed - 07/18/06 <u>FTB's Counsel</u>
Jeffrey Rich

Martin A. Schainbaum, PLC

Issues: 1. Whether a \$142,000,000.00 capital loss from an abusive tax shelter is allowable.

- 2. Whether a taxpayer self-reporting under VCI is eligible for interest suspension pursuant to section 19116.
- 3. Whether the taxpayer is entitled to deduct legal expenses paid in connection with an investment.

<u>Years</u>: 2000 and 2001 <u>Amount</u> \$12,374,510.00

Status: Hearing Scheduled for July 10, 2008, on accuracy related penalty and jury trial.

# GRIBBLE, STANLEY W. & SWG MANAGEMENT COMPANY v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC393360 Filed - 06/26/08

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

James G. Damon, M. Edward Mishow, Esq. W. Dean Freeman

Voss, Cook & Thel, LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether stock basis can be increased when cancellation of indebtness income is not recognized because of the insolvency exception of IRC §108(a)(1)(B).

- 2. Whether various transactions between the Plaintiffs and third parties lacked economic substance.
- 3. Whether the penalty under Revenue and Taxation Code section 19777.5 was properly assesed.

<u>Year</u>: 1994 (Gribble) <u>Amount</u> \$671,102.00 Tax

\$178,015.05 Penalty

1994 (SWG) <u>Amount</u> \$51,179.11 Tax

Status: Summons and Complaint served personally on June 30, 2008.

#### HANGER, DWIGHT T. & VICKI J. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC382988 Filed -12/28/07<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Gordon B. Cutler, Esq. Anthony Sgherzi

<u>Issue</u>: Whether taxpayers constructively received the proceeds from the exchange of LLC memberships for

stock in the taxable year.

<u>Year</u>: 2000 <u>Amount</u> \$324,908.00

Status: Mandatory Settlement scheduled for October 2, 2008. Final Status Conference scheduled for

November 21, 2008. Trial scheduled for December 1, 2008.

HYATT, GILBERT P. v. Franchise Tax Board

Clark County Nevada District Court No. A382999 Filed - 01/06/98

Nevada Supreme Court No. 47141

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

Thomas L. Steffen & Mark A. Hutchison
Hutchison & Steffen, H. Bartow Farr III

McDonald, Carano,

Wilson LLP

Las Vegas, Nevada

Issues: 1. Whether Plaintiff was a resident of California from September 26, 1991 through April 2, 1992.

2. Whether the Franchise Tax Board committed various torts with respect to plaintiff and is subject to a claim for damages.

2. Whether the Nevada courts have or should exercise jurisdiction over the Franchise Tax Board.

Years: 1991 and 1992 Amount \$7,545,492.00 Tax

\$5,659,119.00 Penalty

Status: Clark County Nevada District Court

Trial continuing.

JENSEN, CRAIG C. & SALLY v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. 08K09860 Filed – 04/18/08

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Jonathan Bailey Lappen Filed – 04/18/08

Anthony Sgherzi

Lappen and Lappen

Issue: Whether Revenue and Taxation Code section 17043, which imposes an additional tax of one percent

on taxable income in excess of \$1 million in taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 2005, violates the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution.

Year: 2006 Amount \$19,283.00

Status: Defendant's Demurrer and Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Demurrer to

Complaint filed on June 4, 2008.

KANCHANAPOOM, VISUT & MEECHI v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. NC050569

Taxpayer's Counsel

Kenneth J. Catanzarite

Richard Vergel de Dios

Catanzarite Law Corporation

1. Whether passive activity and capital losses from the disposition of partnership interests are Issue:

deductible in the taxable years in issue.

Years: 1991 through 1995 Amount \$230,632.00

Status: Defendant's Demurrer filed on May 8, 2008. Plaintiffs' Opposition to Demurrer filed on May 28,

2008. Response to Opposition to Demurrer of Defendant to Second Amended Complaint filed on June 3, 2008. Defendant's Answer to Second Amended Complaint filed on June 19, 2008. Final

Status Conference scheduled for January 9, 2009. Trial scheduled for January 20, 2009.

MANNING, LAWRENCE T. & JOY v. Franchise Tax Board

Filed - 12/28/07 Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC382987

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel Gordon B. Cutler, Esq. Anthony Sgherzi

Whether taxpayers constructively received the proceeds from the exchange of LLC memberships for Issue:

stock in the taxable year.

Year: 2000 Amount \$167,710.00

Status: Mandatory Settlement Conference scheduled for October 2, 2008. Final Status Conference scheduled

for November 21, 2008. Trial scheduled for December 1, 2008.

MERCURY GENERAL CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. No. CGC07462688 Filed -04/25/07

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel Roy E. Crawford, Roburt J. Waldow Julian Standen

McDermott, Will & Emery

1. Whether a portion of Plaintiff's insurance subsidiary management expenses was properly Issues: disallowed under Rev. & Tax. Code § 24425.

2. Whether the amnesty penalty under Rev. & Tax. Code § 19777.5 violates the due process clause of the U.S. Constitution, applies only retroactively, or attaches only after a liability becomes due and payable.

12/31/93 through 12/31/96 \$7,238,225.53 Tax Years: Amount

\$4,453,793.66 Penalty

Filed – 12/04/07

FTB's Counsel

Ron Ito

Status: Trial held on May 6, 2008. Waiting for Court's decision.

#### MICKELSEN, PAUL L. & PATRICIA A. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC385197

Taxpayer's Counsel

Charles P. Rettig, Esq.

Steven Toscher, Sharyn M. Fisk

Hochman, Salkin, Retigg, Toscher & Perez, P.C.

Filed – 02/08/08 <u>FTB's Counsel</u> Donald R. Currier

Issue: Whether a taxpayer self-reporting under VCI is eligible for interest suspension pursuant to section

19116.

Year: 1999 Amount \$537,178.00 Interest

**Status:** Case Management Conference held on June 23, 2008. Order to file Notice of Motion and Motion

for Judgment on the Pleadings, and Memorandum of Points and Authorities filed on June 23, 2008. Hearing on Motion and Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings scheduled for August 21,

2008.

#### MICROSOFT CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC08471260 Filed -01/22/08<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

James P. Kleier, Brian W. Toman

Reed Smith, LLP

Joyce Hee

Lucy Wang

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether royalty income received from licensing agreements with Original Equipment Manufacturers should be sourced outside of California based upon costs of performance.

- 2. Whether receipts from trading marketable securities should be included in the sales factor.
- 3. Whether the value of trademarks, copyrights, patents and other intangible assets should be included in the property factor.
- 4. Whether the taxpayer should be allowed a deduction under Revenue and Taxation Code section 24402 for dividends received for the years at issue.
- 5. Whether the amnesty penalty under Rev. & Tax. Code § 19777.5 violates the due process clause of the U.S. Constitution, applies only retroactively, or attaches only after a liability becomes due and payable.

<u>Years</u>: 1995 and 1996 <u>Amount</u> \$25,283,868.00

Status: Case Management Conference continued to September 26, 2008.

#### MIKE, ANGELINA v. Franchise Tax Board

San Diego Superior Court Docket No. 37-2007-00067324-CU-MC-CTL Filed – 05/25/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u> <u>FTB's Counsel</u>

Richard M. Freeman, Carole M Ross

Leslie Branman Smith

Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, LLP

<u>Issue</u>: Whether plaintiff's distribution of gaming income derived from revenue generated on a Native

American reservation is exempted from California tax because plaintiff resided on the reservation of

another tribe.

<u>Year</u>: 2000 <u>Amount</u> \$31,856.00

Status: Trial scheduled for September 19, 2008. Discovery proceeding.

## NEW GAMING SYSTEMS, INC. & AKA INDUSTRIES, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 03AS05705 Filed - 10/10/03

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

<u>FTB's Counsel</u>

Robert R. Rubin Amy Winn

McDonough, Holland & Allen, PC

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether New Gaming Systems, Inc., timely filed its suit for refund for the income year ended March 31, 1996.

2. Whether a declaratory relief action can be brought to prevent the collection of tax.

3. Whether a suit for refund can be maintained for a year in which the amount of tax has not been paid in full.

4. Whether Plaintiffs are liable for California taxes on income generated from leases for operating Indian casinos.

<u>Years</u>: 1996 and 1997 <u>Amount</u> \$111,587.87

Status: Trial set for July 23, 2007 postponed, date unknown.

#### NISSAN NORTH AMERICA, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC373781

Filed – 07/06/07

Taxpayer's Counsel

Richard J. Ayoob

Ajalat, Polley, Ayoob & Matarese

Ronald N. Ito

Donald R. Currier

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether claimed EZ credits were erroneously disallowed.

2. Whether Value Added Taxes should be included in the denominator of the sales factor.

3. Whether other errors were made in computing the taxpayer's tax.

Years: 04/01/01 through 03/31/02 Amount \$725.632.00

Status: Case Management Conference held on May 7, 2008.

NORTHWEST ENERGETIC SERVICES, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No.CGC05-437721 Filed – 01/15/05

Court of Appeal 1<sup>st</sup> Appellate Court Dist. No. A114805

Court of Appeal, 1<sup>st</sup> Appellate Court Dist. No. A115841 (Attorneys' Fees)

Court of Appeal, 1<sup>st</sup> Appellate Court Dist. No. A115950 (Attorneys' Fees)

California Supreme Court No. S162627

Taxpayer's Counsel

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin

Silverstein & Pomerantz

FTB's Counsel

Marguerite C. Stricklin

Issue: Whether Revenue and Taxation Code section 17942, which imposes a tax upon the "total income from

all sources reportable to this state" of LLC registered with the Secretary of State, violates the Due

Process Clause and Commerce Clauses.

<u>Years</u>: 12/31/97 through 12/31/01 <u>Amount</u> \$25,067.00 Fees

\$ 3,764.29 Penalty

Status: Petition for Review denied on June 11, 2008. Remittitur issued on June 12, 2008.

PARÉ, David F. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Diego Superior Court Docket No. IC872806 Filed – 09/21/06

Superior Court Appellate Division No. 37-2008-002000002-CL-MC-CTL

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

David F. Paré, Pro Per Leslie Branman-Smith

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether the child of an individual who lives with the plaintiff qualifies the individual for

head-of-household filing status.

2. Whether the plaintiff has satisfied the requirements for bringing a suit for refund.

<u>Years</u>: 2000 through 2003 <u>Amount</u> \$5,735.90

Status: Appellant's Reply Brief filed on June 5, 2008.

REILING, BERNARD & JUDITH ET AL, v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC378978 Filed – 10/12/07

\*Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

James D. Gustafson, Stephen R. Goostrey

Donald R. Currier

Gustafson & Goostrey, LLP Elisa Wolfe-Donato

Issue: Whether Plaintiffs are entitled to deductions, depreciation, and deferral of gains by virtue of acquiring

monticination write in a trust that does not hold title to the year deplying manager.

participation units in a trust that does not hold title to the underlying property.

<u>Years</u>: 1998 through 2002 <u>Amount</u> \$709,482.00

Status: Final Status Conference scheduled for January 12, 2009. Trial scheduled for January 21, 2009.

#### RIVER GARDEN RETIREMENT HOME v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07467783

Taxpayer's Counsel

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

Filed – 10/02/07 <u>FTB's Counsel</u> David Lew

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to a dividend received deduction under Revenue and Taxation Code section 24402 for the years in issue.

2. Whether the penalty imposed by Revenue and Taxation Code section 19777.5 was properly assessed.

<u>Years</u>: 1999 and 2000 <u>Amount</u> \$5,375.26 Tax

\$ 895.93 Penalty

Status: Mandatory Settlement Conference set for September 5, 2008. Trial set for September 22, 2008.

Discovery proceeding.

#### ROHR, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Diego Superior Court Docket No. 37-2007-00070925-CU-CO-CTL Filed – 09/07/07

Court of Appeal, 4<sup>th</sup> Dist., Div. 1 No. D052309

California Supreme Court No. S161612

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Mark L. Mann

<u>FTB's Counsel</u>
Brian D. Wesley

Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Rohr, Inc. was engaged in a unitary business with Rohr Credit Corporation, its subsidiary.

- 2. Whether losses incurred by Rohr Credit Corporation constituted nonbusiness income.
- 3. Whether plaintiff is entitled to attorneys' fees.
- 4. Whether a suit for refund can be maintained where not all the interest due has been paid.

<u>Years</u>: 07/31/85 through 07/31/87 <u>Amount</u> \$5,155,415.00

Status: Petition for Review was denied on April 16, 2008. Discovery proceeding.

#### SHAW, BRIAN K. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC378829 Filed – 10/10/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

David Roth, Esq. Diane Spencer-Shaw

Hochman, Salkin, Rettig, Toscher & Perez

Issues: 1. Whether Plaintiff was a resident of California for tax purposes.

2. Whether assessing a penalty under Revenue and Taxation Code section 19777.5 violates Due

Process.

Years: 1990 through 1994 Amount \$487,084.00 Tax

\$ 89,534.00 Penalty

Status: Trial Setting Conference scheduled for July 31, 2008.

SHIMMON, EDWARD & ANNELIESE v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC363822 Filed – 12/22/06

Taxpayer's Counsel

Charles P. Rettig, Sharyn M. Fisk

Hochman, Salkin, Rettig, Toscher & Perez, P.C.

Issue: Whether a taxpayer filing under the first option of VCI was eligible for the interest suspension

provided by section 19116.

Year: 1999 Amount \$515,422.00 Interest

FTB's Counsel

**Donald Currier** 

Lisa W. Chao

Status: Hearing on Order to Show Cause held on June 20, 2008. Post Mediation Status Conference

scheduled for October 29, 2008.

THODE, JEROME P. & KATHLEEN A. THODE-FERRIS v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC383969 Filed – 01/17/08

Taxpayer's Counsel
Gordon B. Cutler, Esq.

FTB's Counsel
Anthony Sgherzi

<u>Issue</u>: Whether taxpayers constructively received the proceeds from the exchange of LLC memberships for

stock in the taxable year.

Year: 2000 Amount \$137,694.00

Status: Case Management Conference rescheduled to August 11, 2008.

TOY'S "R" US, INC. & AFFILIATES v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 01AS04316 Filed - 07/17/01

Court of Appeal, 4<sup>th</sup> Appellate Court No. C045386

California Supreme Court No. S143422

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Eric J. Coffill

Steven J. Green

Carley A. Roberts

Morrison & Foerster, LLP

Issue: Whether gross receipts from the sale of short-term financial investment were properly excluded from

the documentation of the sales factor.

<u>Years</u>: 1991 through 1994 <u>Amount</u> \$5,342,117.00

Status: Case is transferred to the Court of Appeal on November 15, 2006, with directions to vacate its decision

and to reconsider the cause of action in light of Microsoft v. Franchise Tax Board (2006) 39 Cal.4th 750

and General Motors v. Franchise Tax Board (2006) 39 Cal. 4<sup>th</sup> 773. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 29.3(d).)

**VENTAS FINANCE I, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board** 

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. 05-440001

Court of Appeal, 1<sup>st</sup> Appellate Court No. A116277 & A117751

Taxpayer's Counsel

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

Filed – 04/01/05

FTB's Counsel

Marguerite Stricklin

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Revenue and Taxation Code section 17942, which imposes a tax based upon the "total income

from all sources reportable to this state" of LLC registered with the Secretary of State, violates the Due

Process Clause and Commerce Clause.

Years: 2001 through 2003

Amount \$29,580.00

Status: Oral Argument scheduled for July 10, 2008.